

## PIKE 2008 TRENDING ACTIVITY SUMMARY

A summary of activities is listed below that were used during the 2008 trending project and during the transition phase from 2007 to 2008.

(1) Correcting Property Class Codes. During the 2006 retrending process the property class codes of all parcels ( commercial, industrial ) involved in the retrend were rechecked for accuracy. There were multiple state-assessed (RR distributable property) parcels that were incorrectly listed as industrial vacant parcels. There were also several parcels owned by Hoosier Energy and Indianapolis Power and Light misclassified as Industrial, instead of local assessed utility. There were also multiple exempt parcels including churches that were miscoded as commercial. Those codes were changed to match the corresponding exempt classification.

Following the revision of the commercial and industrial class codes, the assessor's office began reviewing the class codes of residential and agricultural class codes. The process is still ongoing, but a very large number of class codes have been changes to date, primarily those involving platted vs. unplatted legal descriptions. *A complete revision of the codes should improve the accuracy of any reports that are ran using class codes as the search indicator.*

(2) Neighborhood Review. The boundaries of each neighborhood were reviewed. and *significant* changes were made involving the makeup of various neighborhoods.

When neighborhood delineation's were finalized during the 2002 general reassessment the neighborhood boundaries tended to follow the lines of newer subdivisions or older platted areas. This facilitated the process of setting land values, and simplified data collection and data entry procedures. However, the net result has been an *overstratification* of neighborhoods. In prior years the county has had a very large number of small neighborhoods, primarily in incorporated areas.

During 2008 many of the smaller neighborhoods were combined with nearby smaller neighborhoods, that had similar characteristics and multipliers, to produce larger neighborhoods. By combining neighborhoods a larger pool of sales was available versus having a handful of sales to use in the smaller neighborhoods.

The following is a list of neighborhoods combined for 2008:

Lockhart Twp. #9312 combined into #9305 ( #9312 now inactive)

Jefferson Twp. ( Town of Otwell ), #9205, #9206, #9207, #9209 all combined into neighborhood #9204 ( these are all plats that make up the Town of Otwell)

Marion Twp. (Town of Velpen), combined #9602 into #9603

Monroe Twp. (Town of Spurgeon) combined #9803 and #9802 into #9801.

Patoka Twp. (Town of Winslow) combined #1002, #1004, #1008 into #1003.

Washington Twp. Combined #1108 with #1107; Town of Petersburg combined #1205 into #1204, and #1209 into #1203.

(3) Use of MLS Data. Due to the small size of the county, and the limited number of real estate offices, the amount of MLS data is extremely limited. Much of the data available online must be obtained from agencies from adjacent counties that have parcels from Pike County listed. However, what data that was available has been incorporated into the 2008 trending process and the county has actively used such data for the past 6 years.

(4) On-Site Inspections. Various commercial and industrial parcels were rechecked in the field during the 2006 retrending process, and also during the 2007 and 2008 trending projects. The rechecks involved verification of data on the property cards, checking current and previous occupancy/use, condition and verification of measurements. This review of commercial properties included all of the commercial and industrial parcels in Lockhart and Monroe Townships, about 50% of the parcels in Winslow/ Patoka Township, about 25% of Jefferson Township and about 50 parcels in Petersburg/ Washington Township.

A substantial number of residential parcels were also rechecked during the trending process. The appraisal vendor hired by the county was required to conduct a field review of any residential parcels where the assessed value and sales price differed by at least 20%. During on-site interviews the differences were often due to family or forced sales, however dozens of changes were made to property cards due to remodeling, removals, additions and other changes found in the field. This same procedure was used during the 2006 and 2007 trending projects also. This has resulted in a large number of field checks and updates taking place since 2005.

(5) Disclosure Validation and Verification. The initial verification and validation of sales disclosures is carried out by the assessor's office staff. The primary method used is by mailing questionnaires concerning the sales to both the sellers and buyers. Follow-up calls are used when no data is returned or when the data on the forms conflicts between buyer and seller

(6) Revised Land Values. Land values for each class of property within each neighborhood were reviewed. Various land values were deemed to be too low and were changed during the process. This was carried out by either changing the land rate pages within the county's software system or by applying a trending factor to the land. The method used was determined by which would be most appropriate ( e.g. if all the land within a subdivided neighborhood was too low then it was adjusted with a trend factor. If only the excess acreage in a neighborhood was deemed too low then it was adjusted through changing rates on the land control page).

(7) Incorporation of GIS Data. The county recently obtained a GIS package and has frequently used this new tool as part of the trending process. It should be more helpful during the next general reassessment when it can be used on a more extensive scale.

(8) Broker/ Appraiser Data. Due to the limited amount of sales of commercial and industrial property the county contracted with a local Real Estate Broker in 2007 to obtain written opinion's of value of commercial property along Main Street in Petersburg and of potential industrial sites along Illinois Street in Petersburg/ Washington Township. The county also obtained a narrative from one of the most experienced broker/ appraisers in the county detailing the market conditions found in the Town of Winslow and Patoka Township. This narrative opinion helps document why values of most commercial parcels in Winslow were lowered in 2006 and again in 2007.

(9) Income Data. During the retrending process the county assessor obtained rental data on all of the privately-owned apartment complexes in the county. That data was incorporated into the review and resulted in limited economic obsolescence adjustments. The number of leased office-retail establishments is extremely low and no rental data was gathered on those properties.

(10) Updating Cost Tables/ Revising Depreciation. During the 2006 retrending process the cost tables and depreciation were revised on all commercial, industrial and utility parcels in the county. While this was quite time-consuming during the 2006 retrend, it helped simplify the updates that were made during the 2007 and 2008 trending.

For the 2006 trending four different cost indexes contained in the Marshall Valuation Service were reviewed, and it was determined that an index or factor of 1.27 (127%) should be applied to the cost tables to update the January 1, 1999 costs to bring them to January 1, 2005 levels. These factors were loaded into the control pages of the county's Proval computer system and each c/i neighborhood was recalculated. Following the recalculation new physical depreciation numbers were applied and the parcels were reviewed to see which warranted additional obsolescence. Obsolescence amounts were changed only if sales of similar parcels indicated the values were too high or too low.

During the 2007 trending the same procedure was carried out. The only difference being that the new index/ factor was determined to be 1.33 (133%) and the improvements were redepreciated for January 1, 2006. Once again in 2008 the same procedure was utilized. The factor used for 2008 was 1.39 (139%) and revised physical depreciation was applied based upon an effective date of January 1, 2007.

The updated cost multiplier was applied to all properties outside of Washington Township/ Petersburg. A large enough sample size was available to apply a trend factor to those parcels.

(12) Format Revisions. During the 2007 project some general changes were made to the previous ratio study format. A sales counter was added to the bottom of each page.

Additional columns were added to show 2006 assessed values along with the 2007 assessed values. The adjusted sales price column was split into two columns showing the original sale price and the adjusted sale price. The format was again modified in 2008 to incorporate the county's new 18-digit numbering system and the study was combined into one comprehensive file including statistical summary pages.

(13) Residential Vacant Anomaly. Most of Pike County is typical compared to other small rural counties. One exception to this is Lake Helmerich in Lockhart Township. This is a large development that started in the mid-70's and has never reached its original potential. Lots on the big lake are in short supply and can reach prices between \$10,000 and \$20,000. However, very few off-lake lots were improved and the vast majority are still sitting empty. Sales on these lots can vary between \$100 and \$5,000. There is no established price by the market, and no observable selling pattern. Many of these lots end up on tax sale or go back to the association for failure to pay annual fees. Adding these lots to the ratio study often skews the statistics, and it can also distort studies of percentage value changes over time.